<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1, 4-8, 11, and 13 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

<u>Art Rejection</u>

Claims 1-8, 11, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Morton (USPGP 2005/0216443) in view of Yasujima (USP 4,944,022). Applicant submits that the present amendment clearly overcomes this rejection at least because none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught inhibiting indexing of a unknown word extracted from the document being searched when the type of the document being searched is the character recognition processed document.

<u>Amendment & Interview</u>

Claims 2, 3, and 15 have been canceled, and independent claims 1, 11, and 13 have been amended to incorporate the features of claim 3. Dependent claims 4-6 also have been amended to reflect the changes made to their parent claim 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant again thanks the examiner for granting an interview, which was held on May 1, 2007. During the interview the undersigned explained that Morton (paragraphs 58-60) does not disclose or teach inhibiting indexing of a misrecognized or unknown word in a character recognition processed document, such as when a word "aroma" for example is misrecognized as "arorna."

The undersigned also explained that Yasujima merely recognizes characters and not words, and that the dictionary it refers to is for recognizing different fonts, not words. Further, the undersigned explained that even if Yasujima were to disclose word dictionary for argument's sake (so that it can recognize words), it would not have disclosed or taught any inhibiting means for indexing misrecognized words. The undersigned further explained that "registering of file name" refers to the font dictionary file name for searching operator input search terms and not for an OCR processed document (see column 9, lines 28+).

In response, the examiner states that independent claims 1, 11, 13, and 15 do not define what "a recognition processed document" encompasses. In this respect, the examiner asserts that such a document can include a non-OCR processed document, such as a Word document. The examiner states that, as an example, in a Word document, words can be searched, and if

unrecognized words are found, the user has the option to ignore (not index) or add (index) unrecognized words.

In reply, the undersigned explained that even if that were the case, Morton and Yasujima still would not have taught inhibiting indexing of words if they are misrecognized in an OCR processed document, as opposed to a non-OCR processed document such as a Word document. In this respect, for clarity, independent claims 1, 11, and 13 have been amended to incorporate features of claim 3, namely defining the character recognition processed document, as well as further improving the claim language for added clarity.

Claim 15 has been canceled because it is essentially identical to previously presented claim 13.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

Applicant submits that claims 1, 4-8, 11, and 13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

21 MAY 2007   /Lyle Kimms/
DATE   LYLE KIMMS
                   REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

                   P.O. BOX 826
                   ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
                   703-726-6020 (PHONE)
                   703-726-6024 (FAX)